## REMARKS

Claims 1-16 are all the claims pending in the application.

In response to the Amendment filed March 18, 2003, all of the previous claim rejections were removed. The status of the claims is the following.

Claims 1-6 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by newly-cited Hower Jr. et al. (US 5,467,434; hereafter "Hower"). Claims 7-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hower in view of previously-cited Shimazaki (US 6,396,595). Claims 13-15 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected based claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Also, claim 7 is objected to because of a typo graphical error in the claim, which was introduced in the Amendment filed March 18, 2003. Claim 7 is amended to correct the typographical error, as indicated by the Examiner.

Hower relates to an apparatus and method for determining printer option availability and representing conflict resolution in a combination of print job selections. In Hower, a printing arrangement having a printer bank with a plurality of printers, which are respectively associated with printer profiles and each of the printer profiles has a list of printer properties available at the printer with which the printer profile is associated. The printing arrangement includes: an input section located remotely from the printer bank with a user interface for programming a combination of print job selections and a memory section for storing a selected one of the printer profiles; and a combination examiner for comparing the programmed combination of print job selections from the user interface with a combination of print job selections from the user

interface with a combination of printer properties available in the selected one of the printer

profiles from the memory section. The combination of print job selections is transmitted to one

of the plurality of printers associated with the selected one of the printer profiles when the

combination of print job selections correspond with the combination of printer properties

available at the selected printer. An example of the apparatus of Hower is shown in Figure 2.

Applicant submits that Hower fails to teach or suggest all of the limitations of the claims.

With regard to independent claim 1, Hower does not disclose the merging means comprising

means for, when a desired printing condition color converting means is moved into the storage

area, merging the moved desired printing condition color converting means with the output

condition color converting means into a merged color converting means. With regard to this

feature of the claim, the Examiner refers to column 4, lines 49-61 and column 4, line 66 - column

5, line 10. However, Hower does not disclose or suggest that when a desired printing condition

color converting means is moved into a storage area plays any role in merging printing condition

and output conditions. The portion of the reference cited by the Examiner discloses that the

combination examiner 37 includes a memory location for storing at least one copy of a printer

profile 44 from file 43. Also disclosed is that the combination examiner includes software tools

for comparing a combination of print job selections programmed with the UI 16 with a

combination of printer properties provided in the stored printer profile. Hower further discloses

that a server processor 50 is capable of combining a set of documents 39 with a corresponding

combination of print job selections to form a print job. However, Hower does not disclose a

means for merging a moved desired printing condition color converting means with the output

8

condition color converting means or that the merging is performed <u>when a desired printing</u>

<u>condition color converting means is moved into the storage area</u>.

Therefore, claim 1 and its dependent claims 2-6 and independent claim 16 are not

anticipated by Hower.

With further regard to claims 3 and 4, Applicant submits that Hower does not teach or

suggest all of the limitations of these claims. In particular, Hower does not disclose a means for

merging modified to-be-merged printing condition color converting means with the output

condition color converting means into the merged color converting means, when a to-be-merged

printing condition color converting means stored in the storage area is modified. The Examiner

refers to columns 5, lines 59-66, and column 7, lines 25-55 as allegedly disclosing this feature of

the claims, but Applicant disagrees. Neither of the excerpts referred to by the Examiner

discloses merging of to-be-merged printing condition color converting means stored in a storage

area and output condition color converting means, when the to-be-merged printing condition

color converting means stored in the storage area is <u>modified</u>. Instead, Hower discloses a

process for determining whether a user has entered an impermissible combination of print

selections. See column 7, lines 25-55. By contrast, this excerpt does not disclose merging

modified printing condition color converting means with the output condition color converting

means. Therefore, claims 3 and 4 are not anticipated by Hower for this additional reason.

Regarding claims 5 and 6, Applicant submits that Hower does not teach or suggest all of

the limitations of these claims. Specifically, Hower does not disclose means for, when said

output condition color converting means is modified, merging a to-be-merged printing condition

color converting means stored in a storage area with the modified output condition color

converting means into a merged color converting means. The Examiner refers to column 9, lines 14-23, in relation to this limitation of the claims, but neither the cited excerpt nor the remainder of the reference discloses the aforementioned feature of claims 5 and 6. Hower does not disclose or suggest a means for merging when said output condition color converting means is modified. Thus, claims 5 and 6 are not anticipated by Hower for this additional reason.

Regarding the rejection of claims 7-12 over Hower in view of Shimazaki, Applicant submits that claims 7-12 are allowable over the prior art, at least because Shimazaki fails to make up for the deficiencies of Hower, which were noted above.

Furthermore, there is no suggestion or motivation to combine the teachings of Shimazaki with the teaching of Hower. Shimazaki relates to a method and an apparatus for generating color conversion data to convert color image data C, M, Y, K which are used to produce a printed material into color image data C', M', Y', K' which are used in a color output apparatus to equalize the colors of the printed material with the colors of a color image produced by the color output apparatus. By contrast, Hower relates to a technique for determining whether a combination of print job selections is available at a given printer having a predetermined set of printer properties. Thus, Hower and Shimazaki are quite unrelated. The Examiner asserts that it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the teachings of Shimazaki with the teaching of Hower to produce color images based on color image data of four colors C, M, Y, K needed to effect a color conversion process on given color image data of C, M, Y, K in order to produce color images which represent the colors of final prints highly accurately. However, Hower does not relate to color conversion and provides

an apparatus and a method which are unconcerned with color conversion. Therefore, there is no

motivation or suggestion to combine Hower and Shimazaki.

Hence, claims 7-12 are allowable over the prior art for this additional reason.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed

to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the

Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is

kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue

Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any

overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE
23373
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Cameron W. Beddard
Registration No. 46,545

Date: September 23, 2003

11